DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 252 SO 022 544

AUTHOR Leone, Robert A.
TITLE American Education in Fluxion and the Possibility of a Teaching Profession.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 22p.; Versions of this paper were presented at the Annual Meeting of the Middle Atlantic States Philosophy of Education Society, and the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Philosophy of Education Society (1991).
AVAILABLE FROM Midwest Philosophy of Education Society, 5006 West Grace Street, Chicago, IL 60641 ($10).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History; Educational Philosophy; Educational Principles; *Educational Sociology; Elementary Secondary Education; *Foundations of Education; Teacher Education; *Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

The inability of teaching to rise to the status of a profession is due to a state of flux in which education, teaching, and teacher education finds itself. Five factors have created a fluxion in teacher education. First, the different institutions in which teacher education has been housed (normal schools, teachers colleges, university based schools of education) have critical inconsistent expectations for teacher education. Second, teacher educators historically have set up an ideal of professional education for themselves (the medical school ideal) that they have not succeeded in emulating. Third, the establishment of graduate schools of education has created a new profession of education leadership with goals that are incompatible with the teaching profession. Fourth, educators have failed to establish a discipline of pedagogy that can serve as the basis for the professional authority of teachers. Finally, the public does not perceive educators as producing results that justify the granting of professional authority to them. An outline of this paper and biographical information about the author are included in an appendix. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349252

American Education in Fluxion and the Possibility of a Teaching Profession

by

Robert A. Leone
Temple University

Winner of the Midwest Philosophy of Education Society's 1991 Graduate Student Competition

Versions of this paper were presented at the Middle Atlantic States' Philosophy of Education Society by the Author and by Michael A. Oliker at the Midwest Philosophy of Education Society in the Fall of 1991.

About The Author

Robert A. Leone is the 1991 Winner of the Midwest Philosophy of Education Society's annual Graduate Student Competition. He is a doctoral student in philosophy of education at Temple University in Philadelphia. He holds a BA in philosophy and an M.Ed. in philosophy of education from Temple. Mr. Leone has taught courses in Foundations of Education at both Temple and at Glassboro State College in New Jersey. He is employed as a film projectionist by the United States Department of the Interior at Independence Hall and has recently begun to write original film scripts on topics in American history. His address is:

1117 Titan Street, Philadelphia, PA 19147

SO 022 544

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
MICHAEL A. OLIKER
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

American Education in Fluxion and the Possibility of A Teaching Profession

Robert A. Leone

I. Concepts and Institutions In Flux

There seems to be little doubt that teaching in America has not become a profession in the accepted sense of the term, at least not in the way that law and medicine are so recognized, though they may be regarded as the elite professions. These occupations, along with others slightly lesser in stature such as engineering and architecture, all were subjected to the same phenomenon of professionalization that occurred in this country at the turn of the century. They were transformed into professions but teaching never quite made the change. The reasons lie with the increasingly complex mixture of historical, sociological and philosophical development of American education and its transmission that exists to this very day. It will be my contention in this paper (though not mine alone) that the inability of teaching to rise to the status of a profession is due to a state of flux that education, teaching and teacher education find themselves. It is a diverse plethora that perpetuates confusion over what we mean by such terms which continues to the present. Unraveling this flux is by no means a small task and I cannot hope to achieve it here in complete satisfaction. However, I will attempt to assess some of the key historical and sociological developments that will ultimately lead to a philosophical discussion of whether teaching is a discipline or paradigm from which research, experimentation and methods can be derived to guide the enterprise. There are some who believe that education or pedagogy as a discipline is possible, that a consensus among those in the field can be reached, and if properly formulated and employed, will lead to the acceptance of teaching as a profession. I will consider some of these proposals and arguments in hope of better grasping the problems and solutions inherent with the creation and acceptance of a discipline of pedagogy.

As previously stated, the candidate for an explanation as to why the conception of American education is in a state of flux is to be found in the admixture of historical, sociological and philosophical reasons. But, one may ask that although historical and sociological trends may mix, doesn't philosophy lie outside of these in a more objective sense? It is true that there is an important distinction between a historical and sociological perspective of a profession on the one hand and its criteria on the other.

The latter is the domain of philosophy, but the former may shape the function of philosophy or tap one of its capabilities. A philosophical analysis may reveal that what history and sociology says passes for education in a particular society is really indoctrination. But I do not wish to engage in a debate over the authority of philosophy versus history and sociology. I only want to show that the historical and sociological forces at work during the era of American professionalization significantly altered the concepts of "education", "pedagogy" and "college". It requires a philosophical perspective to understand this change, as well as, to formulate and evaluate the possibility of teaching as a theory-based practice. Furthermore, though a philosophical perspective may indicate that a discipline of pedagogy is possible, these same historical and sociological forces can thwart its creation.

If American professionalization shows us anything, it is that the concepts of "education", "pedagogy" and "college" are not fixed entities secured in meaning and function.[1] The birth of the American public school as an institution and an expanding mass education system from the late 19th century through the 20th century is a relatively new phenomenon. Prior to their emergence, "education" and "teaching" were concepts whose focus was intrinsic individual growth. The cultivated wisdom and moral character of the unique person were the primary goals, thus making education almost exclusively personal and inward looking processes. The expansion of schooling in tandem with the rise of the industrial age and its perceived potentialities for the work force which include professionalism, combined to shift education away from individual growth and towards a more universal and utilitarian instrument necessary to satisfy diverse cultural needs.[2]

The consequence of this changing notion of education was to make it an increasingly complex enterprise. Perhaps the best example of this complexity takes place in higher education where the college in mid-19th century is transformed into the American university. But the transformation is not a smooth one, for with it comes the three trends of utility, research and liberal culture that compete within the university for priority.[3] Likewise, three models in higher education develop that reflect these trends:
the land grant university where utility merges with the supreme faith in science to achieve practical results and efficacy, the research university where research and scholarship become the ideal to pursue knowledge for its own sake and the tradition college which fosters the transmission of traditional culture. But where one trend may have dominated in any one

university, the other two vied for attention and recognition. The diversity of these trends within the university results in the ambiguity of the curriculum. Designing the proper course of study was complicated by the clash of purposes-- from educating the individual (some remnants of the old education persisted in the university) to the pursuit of specialized training, to solutions of immediate practical problems and social demands.[4]

As the transformation of the concept of education led to ambiguity to and confusion, it comes as no surprise that teacher education suffers a similar fate. If we are not sure what education has become, then not only are we unsure of what to teach, but how to teach and, therefore, unsure of the preparatory knowledge and skills for teachers. The confusion over what teacher education should be is borne out in its transition from the normal school to the university education school. the crux of the difficulty lies in the relationship between the study of education and the preparation of teachers.

Could a convincing case be made that teaching is a theory-based practice, i.e., grounded in a discipline or paradigm? Educators hoped that teaching could claim a body of esoteric knowledge that guides the methods and practice in a way that, say, biochemistry and anatomy do so for medicine. Indeed, the success of science as a source of foundation for that field, as well as, for agriculture and engineering made it seem possible that the same could be said of teaching, especially with the expansion of science into such relevant fields as psychology and sociology. However, such hope was overshadowed by the question of whether teaching was essentially a science or an art. If teaching was an art, then was it some sort of recognizable talent that could be located in potential teachers or could it be fostered and transmitted to others? If education was empirical, then the correct targets for examination had to be found and whether it was the learning process, the classroom or the teacher all fed fire to a continuing controversy. But, most of all, one had to come to grips with whether there was a discipline or paradigm of "pedagogy" that was sui generis with principles from which pertinent methods, questions and areas of research could be derived which guide the field on its proper course.(5)

II. Medical Education and the Criteria of a Profession

It may be instructive to compare that circumstances that contribute to the formation of medical education and the medical school with that of the education of teacher if only because the former was one of the first to successfully achieve status as a profession and a profession school, hence, became the model which the education school attempted to adopt.(6) The Johns Hopkins University Medical School served as the exemplar of what training for a theory-based practice should be and pioneered the creation of the professional school. So powerful was its normative image of the ideal medical school that when Abraham Flexner used it as a standard to evaluate and subsequently condemn most of the medical schools in the U.S. and Canada, half of those schools closed within the decade after he published a report (1910-1920). The report seemed to ease the transition of medical training, conducted in medical schools at the time as an apprenticeship for high-school graduates, to a university education which would require a college background in basic science disciplines before admission.(7) Flexner's report alone did not revolutionize medical education, but it was part of a reform movement bolstered by well organized medical societies, particularly, the American Medical Association that sought to eliminate "quacks" in the field as competitors(8) and gain the prestige that both a prerequisite liberal arts education and its compression with scientific research would provide.(9) The ultimate realization of medical education's transition to the university and a key factor to professionalization overall, was that it sociologically changed the entrance into a field from sponsored mobility (who you know)(10) to one that was meritocratic (what you know).

The criteria for the professional school has four elements: 1) its intention or purpose is the training of individuals for a profession; 2) its curriculum seeks to develop practical knowledge and skills of candidates who must have a background in basic disciplines; 3) its program remains autonomous from other departments and colleges in the university and 4) the professional school is influenced by professional organizations and public criticism.(11) The medical school was able to meet this criteria, but schools of education fell short particularly in the areas of curriculum, where disagreement prevents the attainment of a core, and the weak influence of professional organizations along with acute public criticism. However, the latter two outcomes really have their causal roots in the former because if the curriculum of education schools had been able to reflect a consensus of how to train professionals and, hence, actually train them as such, then professional organizations like the National Education

Association, instead of serving merely as an advocate for public education,(12) could strengthen their reciprocal influence upon those schools and the profession itself because the organizations would contain true professionals. Similarly, the recognition by American society that teachers were truly of a profession would dampen public criticism by virtue of teachers position as a profession, hence, their profession school and professional organizations would be able to properly address its concerns.

We need, then, to take a closer look at the historical and sociological forces that were at work during the period of transition of teacher education to the university to better understand how it failed to meet the criterion of the professional school curriculum. It is important to realize that the mass common school movement was in place before the phenomenon of professionalization began to effect American higher education. Indeed, most common schools were at the level of what we call elementary schools today and this created a wide gulf between their relation to institutions of "higher" learning. As the common school system rapidly expanned, it became surprisingly apparent that there was a need for more teachers and a body of thought to guide their preparation.(13) The training of teachers at this time occurred informally, through various study groups and institutes taught by administrators who were given this position by the legislators that felt responsible and held accountable to the general public. By the time it became obvious that this informal structure for teaching training was inadequate, the American high school, perceived in that day as a "college of the people",(14) had emerged as the place to train teachers, usually, in the high school's separate normal department. The latter, in turn, begat the normal school and for the first time, prospective teachers had their incipient professional school.(15)

Notice that, in the span of little more than fifty years (from the mid-1800's to the turn of the 20th century), the training ground for teachers moves from the informal structure of study groups and institutes to the high school and from there to the normal school. Such rapid repositioning of the place for teacher education could not help but contribute to its entanglement in what I have called the fluxion of American education. It is only a short time after teacher training is lodged to the arena of the university, continuing the trend of rapid dislocation.

The incorporation of the normal school into the university mirrored the changing conception of education in the disoriented curriculum of

teacher education. Initially for all professional schools within the university, there was a resistance by academe towards vocational training which results in the former's attempt to make technical knowledge more academic and scientific, but ultimately distorts the focus of the curriculum. In schools of education the problem becomes acutely amplified and divides the faculty into two groups: those who profess scientific and disciplinary knowledge/methods and those who concentrate on the practice of schooling. Ironically, the former are "contextless" from which to apply what they know and the latter lack the tools to illuminate their practical experience.(16) It could be said that three programs of study vied for a dominant position within the teacher education curriculum: the purist, the integrationist and the eclectic.(17) It can be alternately be claimed that the curriculum passed through three phases: practitioner, technologist, and theorist borne out by a cast study of the University of Illinois between the years of 1890 to the 1930's.(18) The first triad is only loosely related to the second and I briefly describe them here only to exemplify the confusion within the teacher education curriculum.

Those who supported a purist curriculum for prospective teachers argued for a four hear concentration in liberal arts that was to be separate from the fifth year of professional training.(19) The integrationists sought to merge or blend liberal/academic education with professional training and it is perhaps with this group that the potential of formulating a discipline of education remains hopeful(20) (a point to which I will return to later). The eclectic program is probably the one that is the most pervasive curriculum in schools of education today. It is parallel curriculum designed to be mutually respectful of both liberal and professional inputs.(21)

The University of Illinois provides and example of what might have transpired at similar land grant institutions. From the beginning, it did not seem to know how to prepare teachers and this was related, again, to the general confusion over the nature of education.(22) Since the curriculum of the normal school had strictly practical concerns such as classroom management, its initial adoption into the University of Illinois understandably pushed teacher training further into a practitioner phase complete with practice-schools. In the second phase, technology began to have a greater impact on the curriculum of teacher training and it seemed to give it that mission element which could elevate teaching into a profession, i.e., the power of scientific achievement.(23) The years between 1920 and 1930 saw the University of Illinois pursue pure science and art which

culminates in the emphasis upon theory. In this theorist phase, teacher education was left behind, remaining largely at the technological stage as it struggled to find a discipline a pedagogy.(24) At this point, the competing arguments between the purists, integrationists and eclectics move on the scene.

If there was confusion and turmoil over the nature of the teacher training curriculum, this perhaps, reflects a larger but similar disorientation over the mission of the university education school that became increasingly broad and takes on diversified goals of specialized training: high school teachers, normal school teachers, school librarians, psychologists, educational researchers and professors of education.(25) A historical perspective could conclude that schools of education tried to do too much, but they really had no choice given the demands of the rapidly expanding American school system. Part of that expansion included the graduate school of education which evolves almost immediately with the transmission of training the educational work force to the university. A significant development occurs in this bastion of the academic profession that impacts upon and misdirects the path teaching takes on the road to professionalization.

III. Misdirected Professionalism: The Graduate Study of Education

The graduate school was the crown jewel of any university because it helped secure the prestige, legitimacy and faith in American higher education. The best examples which show that it deserved such public status was the breakthroughs and discoveries via research and the training of professionals. Education schools seeking to achieve the same status quickly created graduate schools along with undergraduate schools and they did so before other professional schools followed suit.(26) However, despite the education school's position at the vanguard of this development, the pressing demand to provide as many teachers as possible in the public school system curtails that work force's professional aspirations at the level of the undergraduate degree or certification. Most elementary and secondary school teachers did not perceive graduate work as an advancement to a profession (if they ever have at all). This meant that the likely candidates for admission into graduate schools of education were the administrators of the new school system. Thus, what develops in the graduate school of education is a professional culture of academics made up

of school administrators and professors of education who become the self-defined leaders for any reform movement to perpetuate the professionalization of education.(27) But the norms of academic skills rather than professional values dominate the curriculum of the graduate education school and cause it to lose sight of those conceptions of teacher education from the normal school that were more aligned with practical knowledge.(28) So, the prestige of the graduate school that is ruled by the norms of academe and which is enough to create a professional culture of academics, ends up divorcing itself within the college of education from part of its proposed mission: to professionalize teachers.

This development alone may not have been enough to thwart the ascendance of teaching into a profession, but the alienation of public school teachers from the professional culture of academics further aggravates two other sociological trends that compounds the problem: low pay and femininization. The fact teaching is a low paying job has always been the case in America and can be traced to the colonial period. As early as 1658, there was an attempt at Harvard to create scholarships for math teachers to offset the unattractiveness of a meager salary.(29) Low pay contributes to another early pattern in teaching: the high turnover in the field. Both of these factors were present before the femininization of the teaching corps, but served to set the stage for its inception. However, contrary to the assumption that men left teaching due to the professionalization of other occupations to which they were subsequently drawn, one must be reminded that this phenomenon occurs after the common school movement had reached a level of substantial expansion and after the recruitment apparatus for teachers was in place.(30)

This raises a curious problem for historians: why did the displacement of men by women in teaching occur before the professionalization of a number of occupations that would attract men and would ultimately be dominated by them? The answer lies in the social perception of gender as it relates to jobs. The Second Great Awakening (1790's to 1850's) fostered an ideal of the American woman as Christian wife, mother teacher. This ideal is promoted by religious groups who push teaching as an important female mission. Concomitant with this trend, another develops as an effect of the mass education movement: as attendance in district schools rises for females, they are in turn recruited to teach in them.(31) Thus, when the call for more teachers rings out from such highly visible and influential people such as Horace Mann, it propels a

growing female force that was moving in the direction of becoming teachers and with little opportunities for employment elsewhere other than the textile mills.32 Thus, it is not just low pay that keeps men from pursuing a career in teaching, but a social perception that teaching is just not the sort of work men should do. By the time that professional education school rises within the university, femininization of teaching reinforces the perception of it by men as a low prestige job.(33)

The paradox, here, is that the perception of teaching as a low status occupation becomes prevalent in the very institution that claimed, in the formative years, to be able to create a profession of teaching, i.e., the university school of education.(34) Its inability to discover or produce a discipline of education in pedagogy left the prospective teacher with an undergraduate curriculum that was, at best, an eclectic choice between courses in practical and liberal knowledge, did nothing to alleviate the perception and more than likely galvanized it. Hope remained, of course, that the graduate school of education would someday lay claim to such a discipline, but instead, it only gave the appearance that it could by pretending that a science of teaching and learning was imminent. This was enough to instill the somewhat dubious belief that a new profession was created. A widening gulf occurs between undergraduate and graduate programs in education which is indicative of the separation of teachers from the new professional in education: the administrator and educational researcher. As the undergraduate school of education produces teachers, the graduate school produces what is essentially the new school managers who claim specialized knowledge and the salaries of this new professional group quickly surpasses that of teachers.(35)

The message to teachers was clear: if you want to become a professional in the field of education, you must leave teaching and enter administration. The only way you could stay in teaching and still attain professional status was to become a professor of education, but professors in all university graduate schools were shifting away from teaching and more towards the academic norm of research. In any case, the larger professional force was in education administration and as it grows and becomes more bureaucratized, the subordination of teachers is an inevitable outcome as they surrender more of their de facto power to those new managers. (36)

Ironically, the conclusion that is drawn from the historical and sociological analysis of the movement to professionalize teaching is that it

results in a reverse trend: de-professionalization. It may be presumptuous to argue that teaching has become de-professionalized if it has never reached the status of a profession in the first place. But it is important to realize that these historical and sociological developments have created conditions that turn any attempt to professionalize teaching back on itself in such a way as to both inhibits such attempts and cause teaching to lose any preliminary status as a profession. Low pay, feminization and the mass common school movement were previously established inhibitors to the attempt to professionalize teaching, but all of the other disabling trends result from the impact professionalization has upon the conception of American education. Professionalization causes the shift in education from one of personal growth to university utility and places our conception of it in a flux of unresolved confusion that particularly acute in teacher education. This fluxion is borne out in a lack of a consensus among the learned on a discipline of pedagogy, while at the same time, teacher education experiences a rapid displacement from institutes and study groups, to the normal school, to the university. The failure of teacher education to adopt the model of the professional school that was so successful for fields like medicine, the weak professional organizations for teachers which makes them vulnerable to public criticism and the divorce of the graduate education school from teacher education while creating another professional culture that subordinates teachers, all can be traced to the absence of a discipline of education. These combined sociological patterns leave the hope for the professionalization of teaching stillborn within the university and create the adverse effect of de-professionalization.

IV. The Need for a Discipline of Pedagogy

If there had been an established discipline of pedagogy, then there would be a consensus among the learned (i.e., teachers) where there is agreement about concepts and modes of inquiry that would structure the field of practice. Thus, teacher education would be able to meet the criterion of a professional school that calls for a curriculum which develops practical knowledge and skills supported by theory. Teaching as a recognized theory
based practice would strengthen its professional organizations who could, in turn, effectively influence the professional school of education by directing it toward the study of education and teachers for teachers, while coping with and protecting itself from public criticism. Finally, a

professional culture of teachers would emerge that would probably rise to the status level of school administrators (perhaps, making the former more difficult to be managed by the latter).

So much, then, seems to depend upon the creation of a discipline of pedagogy for the transformation of teaching into a profession that one must investigate its possibility. I will make an initial attempt to sketch the elements of a discipline and to do so requires more of a philosophical approach. A discipline is an enterprise of a particular intellectual community that employs one or more paradigms(37) which rule over the enterprise and direct it towards identifying the appropriate phenomena, concepts, theories, data and techniques of methodology which help to determine the problems and solutions that fall into its domain. Disciplines function in professional education in such a way as to structure its field of practice.(38) While a discipline may, at first, appear unique in nature, it is important to note that they borrow information and techniques from other disciplines. Even an apparently autonomous discipline such as mathematics borrows methods from logic which belongs to philosophy. New disciplines are composed of other disciplines e.g., social psychology (sociology and psychology) and biochemistry (biology and chemistry). The unity and uniqueness of a discipline derives from the manner in which it guides the subdisciplines (39) which produce subject matter that is not reducible to them.(40) Thus, the study of law draws upon the subdiscipline of ethics, but the subject matter it yields is that which is legal, not necessarily ethical. Not all disciplines have to be organized hierarchically, i.e., with general laws governing a tight logical structure. A recognized discipline such as English whose modes of inquiry include language, literature, composition, style and communication all are loosely related.(41)

Given this outline of what a discipline looks like, we can begin to see how a discipline of pedagogy takes form. It is composed of subdisciplines such as philosophy, history, sociology, cultural anthropology, political science and psychology which are cross-related in such a way as to achieve complete integration. What would make a discipline of pedagogy fully integrated rather a mere eclectic choice of subdisciplines is the context in which they are presented.(42) Since education is a social enterprise, it would not be enough to present, say, the methods of psychology to the teacher-pupil relationship abstracted from the relation of schooling to society. The structures and processes of any theory of teaching and learning must be assessed in the context of the institutional structures

and processes of contemporary society. Obviously, this requires studies in cultural anthropology and sociology to arrive at the best normative judgements a teacher will have to make.(43) The evolution of institutions in a democracy demands an historical account along with a consideration of political theory.(44) Finally, a philosophical perspective is needed in order to apply the criteria of any pedagogical theory. All of the subdisciplines of a discipline of pedagogy are fully integrated by being presented in the educational context upon which they impinge. If properly conducted, the integration of these subdisciplines forge the modes of inquiry that yield the unique content of pedagogy.

But, it is one matter to describe a possible discipline of pedagogy and quite another to suggest how it can be created and its creation is the first step to professionalization of teaching in America. A recent proposal for a discipline of pedagogy show that its creation begins with the identification of paradigm cases that would constitute a core of experience. These arise from the practice of teaching in the schools so that one can relate what transpires in grade four at school A in community X with what happens in grade four at school B in community Y. From such cases one can collect the legitimate generic activities of teaching. The scholarship of the subdisciplines of pedagogy supports those activities of teaching as generic (45) and so a reciprocal process between practice and theory is set in motion to create pedagogy as an accepted discipline for teacher education.

A proposal such as this appears promising, but much depends upon actual discovery of paradigm cases of teaching-learning so that one can see what they actually look like and, thus, be better to clarify the structure and function of the reciprocal process between practice and theory. In any case, I would suspect that my brief description of it here, along with my definitional sketches of a discipline and a discipline of pedagogy are nothing new to the literature of educational research. I use them only to set up the following question: If a discipline of pedagogy is possible, why hasn't it taken root in the American university?

V. Why Is There No Discipline of Pedagogy?

The answer to this question leads one back to the complicated historical and sociological factors that cause what I have called the fluxion that American education is today and inhibits creation of a discipline of pedagogy. American education as a fluxion results in the university's

attempt to study the possibility of a discipline for education but excludes teaching from the enterprise.(46) It causes the research trend in the university to become increasingly specialized, that, in conjunction with a belief in the science of education, (47) results in the diverse taxonomies of teaching and learning objectives, curriculum design and methodologies.(48) (Indeed, the entrenchment of scientific psychology and sociology within today's education curriculum show no let up of the belief in a science of education.) (49)

The above described proposal to create a discipline of pedagogy via paradigm cases points to the activities of the classroom as the locus of those cases. But the classroom has historically proved to be a difficult domain for educational researchers from the university. This was, in part, due to the prejudice within the professional culture of academics that perceived the activities in the classroom as unacademic and teaching itself as a low status, uninteresting occupation. (50) However, case studies are ethnographic and small-scale which resist the large-scale research of sociology. (51) These conditions have produced the growing separation between the research into teaching and its origin of practice, i.e., the classroom, something that does not occur between schools o medicine and hospitals. (52)

Finally, the expansion of elementary and secondary schools into a mass public school system contributes to the fluxion in American education by creating the circumstances that bring the emergence of school administration as a professional culture from the university graduate school of education and causes the exodus of teachers from their craft. (53). The need to find a discipline of pedagogy is superceded by the migration of teachers into a new field. One recent study argues that the preoccupation with the management of schools in the university has created a mechanism that produces and distributes any knowledge about pedagogy to administrators, Boards of Education and legislators while filtering it away from teachers. (54) In short, the creation of pedagogy as a discipline is inhibited by this intertwining complexity of historical, sociological and political factors, despite how appealing theoretical proposals may be.

One further consideration is needed to show that the creation of a discipline of pedagogy which, in turn, would lead to the professionalization of teaching depends more on directing social and political forces than it does on any attractive theoretical proposal. An occupation is transformed into a profession not only by the practitioner's claim to a body of esoteric

knowledge --- that it is a theory-based practice, but also by convincing the general public that its claim is true. It is often said by professionals that what they have learned in the university as preparatory training differs markedly from what they experience on the job. Medical school students study biology, chemistry and anatomy in the abstract realm of textbooks, charts and theory. But, when they are on the job as doctors, they quickly learn that what they must know is how to diagnose symptoms and observe behavior. Students of law study countless law cases, theories and arguments, but as lawyers they must know how to cut a deal between the prosecution and defense, persuade a jury and defer to the idiosyncracies of judges. In short, the relationship between the knowledge and skills learned in higher education (theory) and job experience (practice) appears tenuous at best and challenges the assumption that a professional applies what he or she learns in school to the everyday practice of the job.

If this argument is correct, then it changes our conception of a profession as evolving out of a foundation of theory or esoteric knowledge. One has to be reminded, however, that both the practice of medicine and law produce successful results. The creation of a vaccine at a research hospital that virtually eliminates a disease, the correct diagnosis and prescribed cure of a common ailment by the family doctor, or an attorney winning a case for a client are what convinces the public to accept doctors and lawyers as professionals even if they achieve that success more from practitioner knowledge than esoteric knowledge. Perhaps this means that practitioner knowledge (that which is learned on the job) is truly esoteric knowledge, not what is learned in the professional school. Yet, the societal phenomenon that develops is that the occupation's ability to produce successful results is what leads the public to accept both it as a profession and the profession's claim that what legitimizes it as a profession is that body of esoteric knowledge learned in school. When we apply this view to teaching and teacher education, we immediately see that teaching has not produced successful results (at least, not successful enough), thus, any claims by the teaching work force to esoteric knowledge are not accepted by society.

I have tried to show that complex of historical, sociological and political factors have prevented the professionalization of teaching by creating a fluxion in the meaning of American education. I have also tried to demonstrate that although a discipline of pedagogy may be possible, its public acceptance depends upon its ability to produce results of successful

teaching and learning that builds a consensus on what we mean by education in this country.

NOTES

1 Henry C. Johnson, Jr. and Erwin V. Johanningmeier, Teachers for the Prairie (Urbana, Chicago, London: University of Illinois Press, 1972), p. 447.
2 Ibid, p. 449.
3 Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1965). Veysey develops the thesis of competition between these trends throughout this book.
4 Johnson and Johanningmeier, op. cit., p. 453.
5 Ibid, pp.451-452.
6 Geraldine Joncich Clifford and James W. Guthrie, Ed School (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1988), pp. 82, 87.
7 Lee S. Shulman, "Reconnecting Foundations to the Substance of Teacher Education", Teachers College Record, Vol. 91. No.3 (Spring, 1990), pp. 300-301.
8 Clifford and Guthrie, op. cit., p. 82.
9 Ibid, p. 56.
10 Ibid, p. 82.
11 Ibid, p. 87.
12 Ibid, p. 80.
13 Johnson and Johanningmeier, op. cit., p. 454.
14 As quoted in Johnson and Johanningmeier, op. cit., p. 455.
15 Ibid, p. 455.
16 Clifford and Guthrie, op. cit., p. 87.
17 Merle L. Borrowman, "Liberal Education and the Professional Preparation of Teachers" in Teacher Education in America (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965), pp.1-53.
18 Johnson and Johanningmeier, op. cit., pp. 456-459.
19 Borrowman, op. cit., p. 28.
20 Ibid, p. 30.
21 Ibid, p. 41.
22 Johnson and Johanningmeier, op. cit., p. 456.
23 Ibid, p. 458.
24 Ibid, p. 459.
25 Clifford and Guthrie, op. cit., p. 54.
26 Ibid, p. 73.
27 Ibid, p. 83.
28 Ibid, p. 84.
29 Borrowman, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

30 Johnson and Johanningmeier, op. cit., p. 454.
31 Barbara Miller Solomon, In the Company of Educated Women (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985), pp. 16-17.
32 Borrowman, op. cit., pp. 21-22.
33 Clifford and Guthrie, op. cit., p. 116.
34 Ibid, p. 116.
35 Ibid, p. 117.
36 Ibid, pp. 117-118.
37 Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1962). Kuhn was the first to use the concept of a "paradigm" in the hard science disciplines.
38 Harry S. Broudy "Case Studies----Why and How", Teachers College Record, Vol. 91, No. 3(Spring, 1990), p. 450.
39 George F. Kneller, "The Proper Study of Education", AESA News and Comments, Vol. 14, No. 2(March, 1984), p. 6.
40 Johnson and Johanningmeier, op. cit., p. 463.
41 Kneller, op. cit., p. 7.
42 Steve Tozer and Stuart McAninch, "Social Foundations of Education in Historical Perspective", Educational Foundations, N.V./1, (Fall, 1986), pp. 20-21.
43 Ibid, p. 21.
44 Ibid, p. 25.
45 Broudy, op. cit., pp. 452-453.
46 Johnson and Johanningmeier, op. cit., p. 464.
47 Ibid, p. 460. and Clifford and Guthrie, op. cit., p. 76.
48 Broudy, op. cit., p. 450.
49 Kneller, op. cit., pp. 7-8.
50 Clifford and Guthrie, op. cit., p. 120.
51 Christopher J. Hurn, The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling, second edition(Massachusetts: Allvan and Bacon, Inc., 1985), p. 196.
52 Clifford and Guthrie, op. cit., p. 120.
53 Ibid, p. 117.
54 James W. Garrison, "Democracy, Scientific Knowledge and Teacher Empowerment", Teachers College Record, Vol. 89, No.4 (Summer, 1988), pp. 487-489.

NOTES ON "AMERICAN EDUCATION IN FLUXION AND THE POSSIBILITY OF A TEACHING PROFESSION" BY ROBERT A. LEONE.

Michael A. Oliker, Midwest Philosophy of Education Society

1. THE AUTHOR. The 1991 Winner of the Midwest Philosophy of Education Society's annual Graduate Student Competition is a doctoral student in philosophy of education at Temple University in Philadelphia. He holds a BA in philosophy and an M.Ed. in philosophy of education from Temple. Mr. Leone has taught courses in Foundations of Education at both Temple and at Glassboro State College in New Jersey. He is employed as a film projectionist by the United States Department of the Interior at Independence Hall and has recently begun to write original film scripts on topics in American history. Mr. Leone would welcome written comments from this audience. His address is:
1117 Titan Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19147.

2. THESIS OF THE PAPER. "... the inability of teaching to rise to the status of a profession is due to a state of flux that education, teaching and teacher education finds itself."

3. ABSTRACT. In a philosophical essay on the historical sociology of teacher education, Robert A. Leone argues that the inability of teaching to rise to the status of a profession is due to the constant state of rapid dislocation that has prevented the establishment of a discipline of pedagogy. Leone terms this state of affairs a FLUXION. Five factors have created a fluxion in teacher education. First, the different institutions in which teacher education has been housed -- normal school, teachers college, university based schools of education -- have had inconsistent expectations for teacher education. Second, teacher educators have historically set up an ideal of professional education for themselves -- the medical school ideal -- which they have not succeeded in emulating. Third, the establishment of Graduate Schools of Education has created a new profession of Educational Leadership that has goals that are not compatible with a profession of teaching. Fourth, educators have failed to establish a discipline of pedagogy that can serve as the basis for the professional authority of teachers. Finally, the public does not perceive educators as producing results that justify the granting of professional authority to teachers.

4. OUTLINE OF THE PAPER.

I. Concepts and institutions in flux.
   A. In addressing the question "Is teaching a profession?" philosophical analysis must supplement and interact with historical and sociological perspectives. Philosophy may emphasize criteria, but this question is not distinct from questions addressed by the historian or the sociologist.
   B. Historical and sociological forces during the late 19th Century Era of Professionalization have influenced the meaning of educational concepts.
   C. Concepts of "education" and "teaching" shifted in meaning from connotation of individual growth to connotation of utilitarian and cultural needs.
   D. The college became the university but the university became three things in one: (1) the public service station -- the utilitarian land grant university; (2) the research university that pursues knowledge for its own sake; (3) the traditional college that transmits culture.
   E. What was teacher education? (The continuing debate.)
      1. A theory based practice grounded in a paradigm?
      2. An agency for individuals with natural ability in "the art of teaching?" (Was it hereditary or teachable?)
      3. A science that generates research problems?

II. Medical education and the criteria of professional education.
   A. The Flexner / Johns Hopkins model of medical education.
      1. Post-bachelor's. 2. Means to eliminate quacks. 3. Entrance on merit, not sponsorship. 4. Autonomous within the university but open to public and professional criticism.
   B. Where teacher education diverges.
      1. Lack of consensus over curriculum. 2. Professional organizations historically weak. 3. History of harsh public criticism. 4. Teacher education originates at the secondary level, not the college level. 5. The result -- FLUXION: rapid dislocation & constant movement (from 1850s to 1930s.) 6. Persistence of competing ideologies since 1930s: (a) Purists demand separate Liberal Arts and Teacher Ed curricula; (b) Integrationists --to blend LA & TE; (c) Eclectics seek parallel "separate but equal" curricula -- most common but TE lacks equality with LA.

III. Misdirected professionalization: The graduate study of Education.
   A. 1930-70: High demand for teachers an obstacle to professionalization; teacher education remains at the undergraduate level.
   B. At the same time, Educational Leadership* is professionalized leaving teacher education in an ambiguous status.
   C. Teachers' pay continues to be low (compared to other professions).
   D. Men still see teaching as a "woman's job" (low prestige).
   E. Ideology of Eclecticism keeps teacher ed at low status within university colleges of education.
   F. Professionalization of Educational Leadership in recent years coincides with attempts to deprofessionalize teaching.

continued

* Educational Administration + Professors of Education = "Educational Leadership"

4. OUTLINE OF THE PAPER (continued)

IV. The need for a discipline of pedagogy: continuing fluxion can be traced to a lack of a discipline.
   A. Criteria: 1. An intellectual community; 2. One or more paradigms; 3. Semi-autonomous; 4. Guides subdisciplines but not reducible to them.
   B. Liberal Arts disciplines can serve as subdiciplines of a discipline of pedagogy.
   C. Pedagogy would integrate its subdisciplines in terms of their presentation in an educational context.
   *D. Pedagogy can be created as a first step towards the professionalization of teaching using the following strategy:
      1. Identify paradigm cases of teaching.
      2. Identify generic activities of teaching.
      3. Identify scholarship that supports these gereric activities.
      4. Set in motion a reciprocal process between practice & theory.

V. Why is there no discipline of pedagogy?
   A. Fluxion inhibits its creation.
   B. Paradigms / taxomonies of teaching-learning based on scientific psychology inhibit creation of paradigms of pedagogy.
   C. Classroom teaching traditionally not seen as worthy of study (however there is a growing ethnographic literature on classroom teaching.
   D. Knowledge about pedagogy directed to educational leaders not teachers.
   E. Creation of a discipline of pedagogy is political: its advocates must persuade the public that they can produce "results."
   F. Teachers' authority based on their ability to produce resuls that public perceives as successful.

* See Harry S. Broudy, "Case Studies - Why and How" Teachers College Record 91 (Spring 1990): 449-459.

5. ADDITIONAL NOTES (by Oliker)

a) Leone seems to place teacher educators in the same position that F. Scott Fitzgerald placed the title character in The Great Gatsby:

> Gatsby believed in the green light, the orgiastic future that year by year recedes before us. It eluded us then, but that's no matter--tomorrow we will run faster, stretch out our arms farther.... And one fine morning--
>
> So we beat on, boats against the current, borne back ceaselessly into the past.

Gatsby is a tragic figure whose efforts to achieve his goals destroy him. Even if this is the situation of teacher educators, can they afford to teach this narrative to their students?

b) Leone is somewhat imprecise about the difference between flux and fluxion. One of my dictionaries defines "fluxion" as the act of flowing and limits "flux" to natural processes. The other dictionary omits the word fluxion and lists "an act of flowing" as one definition of the word "flux." Or is this "just semantics"?

c) It seems to me that Leone is writing speculative philosophy of history in this paper, not history. That is: he is asking how the history of teacher education should be understood, not telling us new historical facts. Or else what?

END. 22